

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please substitute the attached two sheets of drawings (Figs. 7-8, 21-22) for the drawings currently pending. Figure 8 now contains reference numerals and Figure 22 has been amended to correctly identify reference numeral 1400 as 1900.

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-14, 20-22 and 29-31 have been cancelled. Claims 15, 24 and 33 have been amended and claims 42-56 are new. Consequently, claims 15-19, 23-28, and 32-56 are pending.

Initially, Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's consideration of, and making of record, the various documents submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements.

In paragraph no. 1 of the Office Action, it was indicated that Applicants have not provided a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.33(a). However, the undersigned respectfully submits that each of the inventors signed a Declaration which includes post office address information as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.33(a), a copy of which is submitted herewith. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

The drawings stand objected to for failure to include certain reference signs and for an apparent omission of Figures 2, 15a and 15b. Initially, the undersigned notes that these figures were submitted with the originally filed application and are currently of record in the official electronic version of the application found in public PAIR. For example, see the entry labeled "Drawings" and dated January 30, 2004. It is possible, however, that the Examiner is referring to the drawings which were subsequently submitted associated with the provisional application. Many of the allegedly missing reference numerals can be found in the originally filed drawings, copies of which are also submitted herewith.

However, Applicants also submit replacement sheets of Figures 8 and 22 to provide the missing reference numerals. Upon approval by the Examiner, these changes will be implemented in formal drawings.

The specification stands objected to in paragraph no. 3 of the Official Action

because it does not include reference numerals 510, 514 and 1206 in the figures. With respect to Figure 6, paragraph [0041] has been amended above to include reference to reference numerals 510 and 514 of Figure 6. However, with respect to the comment regarding Figure 12, it is noted that the originally filed drawings (filed on January 30, 2004) find reference numeral 1206 in Figure 14 and not Figure 12. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 15-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldschmidt in view of Brown. Prior to discussing this ground of rejection in detail, a brief summary of exemplary embodiments of the present invention is provided below in order to highlight some of the advantageous characteristics thereof.

According to one exemplary embodiment, a method for interfacing with a plurality of images each of which represents a selectable media item provides various mechanisms for enhancing navigation and providing a sense of relationship between a first position at which the user is currently viewing the graphical user interface and a second position to which the user navigates as a result of some input, e.g., clicking on a DVD cover art image. For example, when a cursor is moved over one of the images at a first semantic level of the user interface, a hover zoom can be performed which enlarges that particular one of the images in response to the cursor movement. This may cause, for example, one of the plurality of images over which the cursor is currently positioned to overlap others of the images at that first semantic level of the user interface. Moreover, additional information can be displayed which is associated with the image that was enlarged, e.g., prior to launching the media item which is represented by the enlarged image. After receiving a selection input associated with that particular one of the images, the media item which is represented thereby can be launched. Thus, methods, systems and software associated with these exemplary embodiments provide a number of techniques which facilitate navigation of large collections of media items.

By way of contrast, the Goldschmidt patent refers to a graphical user interface including a plurality of windows that display video data associated with entertainment

selections. Figure 6 of Goldschmidt is illustrative. According to column 9, lines 30-39 of Goldschmidt, a user may select one of the windows in the user interface to watch the entertainment selection corresponding to the selected window on a full screen of the television monitor. Alternatively, a user may select one of the windows to obtain additional entertainment system data corresponding to the entertainment selection corresponding to the selected window.

However, as recognized in the Official Action, Goldschmidt does not provide a technique whereby when a cursor is moved over one of the images that image is enlarged and overlaps another one of the images on the screen. Accordingly, the Official Action relies upon the Brown patent publication to allegedly remedy this deficiency.

The Brown patent publication describes an apparatus and method for viewing thumbnail images corresponding to print pages on a view of a display. As shown in Figure 5, one embodiment of Brown provides for a mechanism which provides a temporary enlargement of a selected thumbnail image. See e.g., paragraphs 47 and 48 of Brown. However, it is respectfully submitted that no combination of Goldschmidt and Brown would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicants' claimed combinations for at least the following reasons.

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that no combination of Goldschmidt or Brown could possibly have enabled one of ordinary skill in the art to reach the amended claim combinations because, among other things, neither teach nor suggest the step of: "displaying additional information associated with the one of the plurality of images after enlarging the one of the plurality of images and prior to launching a media item represented by one of the plurality of images" which is recited, among other things in Applicants' amended claim 15 combination. In this regard, it is noted that the secondary reference to Brown is not concerned with launching media items represented by one of the images, but instead merely provides a mechanism for viewing thumbnail images which are to be printed. Goldschmidt, on the other hand, does enable a user to launch a media item to, e.g., view a full screen version of an entertainment selection. However,

since Goldschmidt does not teach or suggest enlarging one of the plurality of images and Brown is unconcerned with launching a media item, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art could not have arrived at a step of displaying additional information after enlarging an image and prior to launching a media item represented by that image which was enlarged.

Secondly, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to have combined Goldschmidt and Brown in the manner suggested in the first instance. In this regard, it is noted that the Official Action provides an indication that the rationale for combining these two documents is "so that users can simultaneously view multiple images and their location for navigational purposes." However, Goldschmidt already provides a scrollbar 670 for navigation and only has a single level to its user interface. Accordingly, there is no reason to provide an additional mechanism which would allegedly enable users to "simultaneously view multiple images and their location for navigational purposes." Only Applicants' specification teaches the combination of features described in the claim 15 combination to enhance navigation in a user interface.

Similar comments apply to the other independent claims.

Additionally, the undersigned would like to draw the examiner's attention to the newly submitted dependent claims 42-45, 47-50 and 52-55. These claims recite further details regarding transition effects, for example, which are provided in order to enhance a user's perception of the relationship between locations on a user interface as that user transits between two different semantic levels of the interface. The claimed transition effects are not taught or described by the applied references, nor is this surprising since neither of them are concerned with user interfaces involving multiple semantic levels.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Goldschmidt in view of Brown are respectfully requested.

All of the objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, she or he is invited to contact the undersigned at (540) 361-1863.

Respectfully submitted,

POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC

By: 

Steven M. duBois

Registration No. 35,023

Date: July 6, 2007

Potomac Patent Group PLLC  
P.O. Box 270  
Fredericksburg, VA 22404  
(540) 361-1863